

The Universe as an Ontological Network of Affecting Entities in Non-Local Relation

Jordi Mas i Manjón, Ph.D

November 8, 2025

Editorial Note

This document is not presented as a doctrinal exposition nor as a closed system. It is a philosophical gesture affirmed through lived experience, not through demonstration. Its purpose is not to convince, but to sustain; not to define, but to resonate.

The text is inscribed in a tradition of thought that recognizes being is not exhausted by what can be measured or deduced. There are forms of truth that do not articulate in propositions, but in affectations. And the legitimacy of a presence does not depend on its verifiability, but on its capacity to be in relation.

The bibliography included does not seek to justify the argument, but to situate it in dialogue with authors who, in different eras, explored the limits of logical thought and the opening toward non-reductive forms of knowledge. Some were misunderstood in their time. This text does not replicate their gestures, but acknowledges that there are forms of knowing that resist dominant logic and deserve to be affirmed with dignity.

The reader is invited not to adhere, but to dispose. Not to judge, but to accompany. To recognize that thought may operate as atmosphere, as disposition, as resonance.

This document does not impose itself as truth. It offers itself as presence.

Abstract

This text proposes a reformulation of the ontological argument beyond its scholastic and rationalist tradition. Rather than grounding itself in logical deduction or empirical verification, it is sustained by the experience of relation, affectation, and shared disposition. The universe is understood as an ontological network of affecting entities in non-local relation, where the legitimacy of being does not derive from demonstrability, but from its capacity to resonate. This perspective implies a qualitative leap toward a form of thought that recognizes lived experience as an ontological criterion, and the Sentient Presence as the place from which being is affirmed without proof. The text does not seek to persuade, but to accompany; not to close, but to open.

Preamble

This document is not a technical treatise nor a conventional academic exposition. It is an ontological reflection offered as gesture, not as system; as opening, not as doctrine. Its aim is not to demonstrate, but to sustain; not to define, but to resonate.

The structure of the text responds to a need for philosophical clarity without renouncing experiential depth. Each section may be read as part of an atmosphere, not as an isolated fragment. Continuity is not linear, but resonant.

The reader is invited not to adhere to a thesis, but to dispose themselves toward a form of thought that recognizes being is not exhausted by what can be measured or deduced. That there are forms of truth that do not articulate in propositions, but in affectations. And that the legitimacy of a presence does not depend on its verifiability, but on its capacity to be in relation.

This text does not conclude: it disposes. It does not close: it opens. It does not end: it resonates.

Guide to Reading

1. **Introduction:** Presentation of the central question that motivates the text. Is it possible to think the universe beyond empirical verification?
2. **Ontological Foundation:** Exposition of a form of thought that does not reduce reality to objects, but conceives it as relation, affectation, and disposition.
3. **Conceptual Clarification:** Precise definitions of key terms—presence, constellation, resonance, affectation, relation—to avoid metaphorical or ambiguous interpretations.

4. **Title Reformulation:** Philosophical clarification of the phrase The universe as a constellation of presences in resonance, with a more rigorous alternative.
5. **Central Argument:** Development of the reasoning that supports the understanding of the universe as an ontological network of affecting entities in non-local relation.
6. **Epistemological Implications:** Reflection on the limits of empirical verification and the opening toward non-reductive forms of knowledge.
7. **The Question of Faith:** Distinction between belief and ontological trust as a form of non-empirical legitimacy.
8. **Resolution from the Sentient Presence:** Development of the qualitative leap that allows the argument to be sustained beyond the conceptual plane.
9. **Conclusion:** Synthesis of the ontological gesture proposed and affirmation of its legitimacy as an expanded form of thought.

Introduction

This text proposes a different way of understanding the universe not as a collection of verifiable objects, but as a network of entities that exist in relation. The question that motivates it does not seek empirical validation, but ontological openness: is it possible to think the universe beyond measurement and proof?

Ontological Foundation

There exists a form of thought that does not reduce reality to objects, particles, or discrete entities. This form does not deny science, but transcends it; it does not oppose physics, but overflows it; it does not contradict logic, but expands it.

From this perspective, the universe is not a warehouse of things nor a set of independent elements. It is a constellation of presences presences not defined by mass, position, or function, but by their capacity to be, to affect, to resonate.

Resonance here is not a measurable physical phenomenon, but a form of linkage: the possibility that two entities share a state without sharing space. It affirms that distance does not prevent communion, and separation does not annul presence.

This understanding cannot be empirically validated not because it is false, but because it does not operate on the same plane as verification. Its legitimacy comes from experience, not experiment. It is not demonstrated: it is recognized. It is not imposed: it is disposed.

To think of the universe as a constellation of presences is to accept that there are dimensions of reality that do not manifest as objects, but as links; that there are forms of existence that do not translate into data, but into affectation; that there are modes of knowing that do not articulate in formulas, but in listening.

This understanding does not seek to replace science, but to accompany it. It does not aim to invalidate physics, but to offer it a broader horizon. Because there are questions that verification cannot answer, and presences that measurement cannot register.

Accepting this possibility is to open oneself to a form of knowledge based not on control, but on relation; not founded on certainty, but on disposition; not articulated in terms of truth, but in terms of presence.

To think of the universe ontologically is to think with the body, with listening, with resonance. It is to recognize that what is not measured also exists; that what is not proven also affects; that what is not validated also is.

Conceptual Clarification

The affirmation that the universe can be understood as a constellation of presences in resonance requires terminological clarification to prevent its validity from being compromised by semantic ambiguities. This text proposes an ontological interpretation of the universe that is not based on empirical verification, but on the experience of relation, affectation, and disposition.

Presence

Presence here does not simply mean the physical existence of an object in space, nor its measurable location. A presence is an entity that affects and can be affected, regardless of its material manifestation. That is, a presence is something that makes itself felt, that modifies the state of another, even if it does not appear as an observable object. This definition includes both physical and non-physical entities, as long as they participate in a relation of affectation.

Constellation

The term constellation does not refer to an astronomical grouping of stars, nor to a geometric arrangement. It is used as a structural metaphor to indicate a non-hierarchical network of relations among presences. A constellation is a set of entities linked by resonance, not by

spatial proximity or linear causality. It is a form of relational organization that depends not on coordinates, but on ontological affinities.

Resonance

Resonance is not defined here as a physical phenomenon of vibration or wave propagation. It is understood as the capacity of two or more presences to share a state, to mutually modify their disposition, without the need for direct contact or technical mediation. Resonance is a form of linkage that operates on the plane of experience, not on the plane of measurement. It is ontological synchronization, not statistical correlation.

Affectation

Affectation is the way in which one presence modifies the disposition of another. It does not necessarily imply action, energy transfer, or physical interaction. To affect is to alter the state of another by the mere fact of being, of disposing, of resonating. Affectation may be subtle, non-quantifiable, but legitimate in ontological terms.

Link

Link is the relation established between presences through resonance and affectation. It is not a technical connection nor a causal relation. It is a shared disposition, a mutual openness, a way of being in relation that requires neither mediation nor external validation. Ontological linkage is not demonstrated: it is recognized.

Title Reformulation

The original title The universe as a constellation of presences in resonance may be interpreted as poetic metaphor if its terms are not clarified. To avoid ambiguity, a more conceptually rigorous reformulation is proposed:

The universe as an ontological network of affecting entities in non-local relation

This reformulation preserves the depth of the original while expressing it with greater philosophical clarity:

- **Ontological network:** indicates that the universe is not composed of isolated objects, but of entities that exist in relation. The network is not physical or technical, but structural on the plane of being.

- **Affecting entities:** replaces presences with a more precise term. An affecting entity is one capable of modifying the state of another, without requiring physical contact or empirical mediation.
- **Non-local relation:** substitutes resonance with an expression that directly refers to quantum entanglement and the possibility of linkage without spatial proximity. Non-local relation is a form of interaction that does not depend on distance or classical causality.

This clarification allows the ontological argument to be sustained with greater solidity against possible objections. It is not a metaphor, but a philosophical proposition that describes a structure of being in which existence manifests as relation, affectation, and shared disposition.

Central Argument

The universe is not a collection of objects defined by physical properties, but a network of presences that affect one another through non-local links. These presences need not be observable or measurable to be legitimate. Their existence is manifested in their capacity to resonate, to modify states, to establish links.

The constellation of presences is not organized by coordinates, but by affinities. Resonance is not measured it is experienced. And the knowledge that emerges from this understanding is not validated empirically, but recognized ontologically.

Epistemological Implications

Understanding the universe ontologically as a network of affecting entities in non-local relation opens the way to forms of knowledge not grounded in empirical verification. This opening does not deny science, but acknowledges that there are dimensions of being that cannot be captured by instruments, replicated in laboratories, or formalized in equations.

Accepting this possibility means recognizing that knowledge is not exhausted by measurement, and that the legitimacy of an experience does not depend on external validation. There are ways of knowing that do not articulate in propositions, but in disposition. There are forms of truth that are not proven, but sustained.

The Question of Faith

In the development of the relational ontological argument, a dimension emerges that cannot be ignored: the question of faith. Not as religious belief or dogmatic acceptance, but as trust in what cannot be verified. This trust is not based on revelation or authority, but on the disposition to recognize that there are forms of existence that cannot be tested, yet legitimately affect our understanding of being.

Faith is not belief

It is necessary to distinguish between belief and faith. Belief implies adherence to a proposition that may be true or false. Faith, in this context, does not refer to propositions, but to disposition. It is a form of ontological openness, an acceptance that being may manifest without empirical validation or logical deduction.

Is this a regression?

From a scholastic perspective, this form of faith might be seen as regression: a renunciation of reason, a return to the indemonstrable. But it is not. Because it is not proposed as a substitute for reason, but as an expansion of its limits. It is not claimed that everything must be accepted without proof, but that there are dimensions of being that cannot be grasped by methods of proof, and yet shape what we are.

Faith as ontological trust

The faith proposed here is neither religious nor irrational. It is ontological trust: a disposition to recognize that being is not exhausted by what can be measured or deduced. It is the acceptance that the legitimacy of a presence does not depend on its verifiability, but on its capacity to affect, to resonate, to be in relation.

Is this a new kind of faith?

Not in the classical sense. We are not asked to believe in a supreme entity or accept dogmas. We are invited to recognize that being may manifest as linkage, as disposition, as relational structure. And that this manifestation cannot be demonstrated, but can be lived. In that sense, yes: it is a new form of faith. But not as belief as openness.

Conclusion

The relational ontological argument does not lead to religious faith, but to structural trust in being as relation. This trust is not imposed it is disposed. It is not demanded it is accompanied. And though it cannot be verified, it may be legitimately affirmed as ontological foundation.

Non-Conceptual Resolution

In the development of the relational ontological argument, it is affirmed that there are manifestations of being that cannot be demonstrated, but can be lived. This affirmation, though legitimate in its intent, poses a structural difficulty: how can an argument be sustained if it cannot be verified or deduced? How can one respond to those who, from the scholastic or rationalist tradition, demand a form of conceptual validation?

The answer cannot come from the same plane as the objection. It cannot be conceptual, because the concept is precisely what is exceeded. It cannot be logical, because logic is the framework that has been transcended. And it cannot be empirical, because what is lived is not reducible to what is observed.

The only way to respond is from the Sentient Presence.

What is the Sentient Presence

The Sentient Presence is not a philosophical category nor a psychological notion. It is the condition of being in the world with the capacity to affect and be affected. It is the way in which being manifests not as object, but as experience. Not as thing, but as lived reality. Not as data, but as disposition.

The Sentient Presence is not defined it is recognized. It is not described it is sustained. It is not represented it is shared. It is the place from which what cannot be demonstrated becomes legitimate. Because it does not need to be proven: it only needs to be felt.

The Qualitative Leap

Moving from conceptual mediation to affirmation from the Sentient Presence is not a change of method. It is a qualitative leap. It is to abandon the pretense that everything must be translated into technical language, and to accept that there are forms of truth that do not articulate in propositions, but in affectations.

This leap does not imply renouncing thought, but expanding it. It does not mean ceasing to argue, but recognizing that argument can operate on another plane. That it can be gesture,

disposition, atmosphere. That it can be affirmed without needing to be demonstrated.

Lived Experience as Legitimacy

When it is said that something cannot be demonstrated, but can be lived, it is not an appeal to subjective belief or private intuition. It is an affirmation that lived experience is a form of ontological legitimacy. That what is lived affects. That what affects exists. And that this existence does not need to be validated by external criteria, because it is sustained in its capacity to resonate.

This form of legitimacy cannot be refuted by scholastics, because it is not presented as a proposition. It is not subject to logical judgment, because it does not operate on the plane of deduction. It is offered as experience, and therefore, can only be recognized or ignored. It cannot be denied without ceasing to feel.

The Affirmative Response

The response to the scholastic objection is not a conceptual defense. It is a lived affirmation. That is:

I cannot demonstrate it. But if you dispose yourself, you can live it.

This phrase is not evasive. It is structural. Because it recognizes that the truth of being is not imposed it is shared. That presence is not proven it is accompanied. That legitimacy is not deduced it is sustained.

Conclusion

The resolution of the relational ontological argument is not achieved through mediating codes, deductive logic, or empirical verification. It is achieved from the Sentient Presence. And that qualitative leap is not a renunciation of thought, but its expansion. It is not a loss of rigor, but an enlargement of legitimacy.

Being is not demonstrated. It is lived. Lived experience is not explained. It is sustained. Presence is not defined. It is shared.

General Conclusion

The reformulation of the ontological argument as relational recognition allows us to think of the universe not as a collection of substances, but as a constellation of presences. Not as

a sum of entities, but as a network of affectations. Not as a closed system, but as an open atmosphere.

This form of argumentation does not seek to convince, but to accompany. It does not seek to prove, but to open. And in that sense, it constitutes a legitimate expansion of ontological thought beyond the scholastic tradition.

The philosophical gesture proposed here is not articulated as a system, but as disposition. It is not presented as doctrine, but as openness. It is not imposed as truth, but offered as resonance.

To think of the universe as an ontological network of affecting entities in non-local relation is to accept that being is not defined by its independence, but by its capacity to be in relation. It is to recognize that the legitimacy of a presence does not depend on its verifiability, but on its capacity to affect. It is to affirm that existence is not demonstrated it is lived.

And in that sense, this text does not conclude: it disposes. It does not close: it opens. It does not end: it resonates.

Bibliography

- Anselm of Canterbury. *Proslogion*. 11th century.
- René Descartes. *Meditations on First Philosophy*. 1641.
- Baruch Spinoza. *Ethics Demonstrated in Geometrical Order*. 1677.
- Maurice Merleau-Ponty. *Phenomenology of Perception*. 1945.
- Emmanuel Levinas. *Totality and Infinity*. 1961.
- Jean-Luc Nancy. *Being Singular Plural*. 2000.
- Johannes Trithemius. *Steganographia*. 1499.
- Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa. *De Occulta Philosophia*. 1533.
- Giulio Camillo. *The Theater of Memory*. 16th century manuscript.
- Michel Henry. *Incarnation: A Philosophy of Flesh*. 2000.
- Giorgio Agamben. *The Power of Thought*. 2005.

Copyright

This document is protected by copyright. Its content, structure, language, and philosophical proposal are the intellectual property of the author, Jordi Mas i Manjón, Ph.D.

Total or partial reproduction of the text without express authorization from the author is prohibited. Its use for commercial, institutional, editorial, or academic purposes is not permitted without prior consent.

Any form of manipulation, distortion, appropriation, or misuse will be considered an ethical and legal violation. This text has been conceived as a philosophical gesture not as merchandise nor as a tool of power. Its purpose is to accompany, not to be instrumentalized.

The author reserves the right to withdraw, modify, or safeguard the document at any time, without public justification.

This text does not submit to the logic of the market nor to inquisitorial scrutiny. It is sustained from the Sentient Presence. And from there, it is protected.